

REMARKS

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reexamination of the present application. No claims have been amended, cancelled or added.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's removal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 and the art rejections based on U.S. Patent Nos. 5,471,112; 5,881,924 and 5,725,800.

OBJECTIONS

The Examiner has objected to the amendment filed on July 18, 2006, under 35 U.S.C. 132, stating that the amendment introduces new matter into the disclosure.

The Examiner states that the added material that is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: Both occurrences "about" in the insertion made to page 47, line 17 and in the first insertion made to page 53 and both occurrences of "preferably" in the insertion made to page 58.

With respect to the amendment made to the paragraph beginning at page 47, line 17, Applicants note that this amendment ("from about 1100°C to about 1600°C") is fully supported by originally filed Claim 127. With respect to the amendment made to the paragraph beginning at page 53, line 18 ("from about 900 to about 950°C") Applicants note that this amendment is fully supported by originally filed Claim 138. Therefore, removal of the objection with respect to these amendments is requested.

With respect to the amendment made to the paragraph beginning at page 58, line 20, Applicants have now amended the specification to remove the language that was previously inserted. Therefore, removal of this objection is requested.

The Examiner has also objected to the disclosure stating that Applicants give two different paragraphs to replace that beginning at page 53, line 18. In this regard, Applicants now submit an amended paragraph beginning at page 53, line 18, which reflects amendments made to the originally-filed specification. Therefore, removal of this objection is also requested.

DOUBLE-PATENTING REJECTIONS

The Examiner has rejected Claims 62-64, 68, 72, 73, 76-81, 86 and 87 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 6, 124-127 of U.S. Patent No. 6,180,029 by Hampden-Smith et al. The Examiner states that although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the plasma display panel claimed in the patent has the same structure as that claimed in this application and the phosphors in the patented claimed panel has the same compositions and an average particle and crystallite size and distribution which overlaps and falls within the claimed ranges. The Examiner also states that it is well known in the art that the excitation source in plasma display panels is xenon gas, thus the patented and claimed panels would be expected to contain xenon gas as the excitation source. The Examiner states that Claim 6 teaches the amount of activator in Zn_2SiO_4 : Mn and this amount falls within the range claimed in this application.

The Examiner has also rejected Claims 62-69, 74 and 75 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 19-27 of U.S. Patent No. 6,197,218 by Hampden-Smith et al. The Examiner states that although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claimed fluorescent lighting element of the patent suggests that claimed in this application.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 62-64, 72, 73 and 76-81 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 8-14 and 30-35 of U.S. Patent No. 7,005,085 by Hampden-Smith et al. The Examiner states that although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the plasma display panel claimed in the patent has the same structure as that claimed in this application and the phosphors in the patented claimed panel has the same compositions and an average particle and crystallite size and distribution which overlaps and falls within the claimed ranges. The Examiner also states that it is well known in the art that the excitation source in plasma display panels is xenon gas, thus the patented and claimed panels would be expected to contain xenon gas as the excitation source. The Examiner states that it is also well known in the art that the dopant

used in barium magnesium aluminate is europium and the amount of the dopant is 0.01-15 at. %.

In this regard, Applicants submit herewith three Terminal Disclaimers with respect to the foregoing commonly-owned U.S. Patents. Therefore, removal of this obviousness-type double patenting rejection is requested.

Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecute and or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

By: /David Dockery Reg No 34323/
David F. Dockery
Registration No. 34,323
3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411
Aurora, Colorado 80014
(303) 338-0997

Date: October 16, 2006